			1
**************************************	UNITED STATES I EASTERN DISTRIC		
2		X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	: 98-CR-1101	
4	v.	: U.S. Courthouse	
5	JOHN DOE,	Brooklyn, New York :	
6	Defendant.	June 14, 2010 : 12:00 o'clock p.m.	
7		X	
8		••	
9		MOTION HEARING NORABLE I. LEO GLASSER	
10	UNITED STATES		
11	APPEARANCES:		
12			
13	For the Movant:	KELLY MOORE, ESQ. BRIAN HERMAN, ESQ.	
14	For the Respondent:	RICHARD E. LERNER, ESQ.	
15		LAUREN ROCKLIN, ESQ.	
16	For Non-Party Movant:	STAMATIOS STAMOULIS, ESQ.	
17	Court Reporter:	Anthony M. Mancuso 225 Cadman Plaza East	
18			
19		Brooklyn, New York 11201 (718) 613-2419	
20			
21			
22			
23	Proceedings recorded by mechanical produced by CAT.	stenograpny, transcript	
24			
25			
!	1		

2

1 (Case called; both sides ready.) MS. MOORE: Kelly Moore and Brian Herman for the 2 3 movant, John Doe. MR. LERNER: Richard Lerner of Wilson Elser and 4 5 Lauren Rocklin for nonparty respondent Frederick Oberlander. MR. STAMOULIS: Stamatios Stamoulis for Jody Kriss 6 7 and Michael Ejekam, nonparty movants. MS. MOORE: Your Honor, we have received the letter 8 9 of this morning written by Mr. Lerner accusing me of an 10 ethical violation, based on a conversation that I had with 11 Mr. Stamoulis. As an initial matter, I completely disagree 12 with the characterization of the description of that 13 conversation to which Mr. Lerner was not a party and I believe 14 that if the court were to inquire of Mr. Stamoulis he would 15 advise the court that that description is completely 16 inaccurate. No threats whatsoever, implicit or explicitly, 17 were made during the course of that conversation. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 MR. LERNER: I will withdraw it based on Ms. Moore's 20 representation to the court. 21 THE COURT: What was the basis for making that 22 representation to begin with? 23 MS. MOORE: An e-mail to me which indicated that 24 Ms. Moore had stated to Mr. Stamoulis that the Eastern 25 District attorney was watching this case and that quote there

may be indictments and coupled with the settlement proposal offered by Ms. Moore.

MR. STAMOULIS: Your Honor, if may speak to that?

I'm Mr. Stamoulis. I had a very friendly conversation with

Ms. Moore that I initiated on behalf of my clients, Mr. Ejekam

and Mr. Kriss. Actually, the reason why I called her is to

advise her that Mr. Ejekam was in Africa and there not be any

surprise that he was not going to be present to give any

testimony here today.

That led to a conversation and during that conversation Ms. Moore just gave me information. When I put the information that she gave me into an e-mail, the tenor and the tone of the conversation didn't translate and I can see why my e-mail could have been misconstrued and it lacked the context.

MR. LERNER: So I apologize to Ms. Moore and the court.

THE COURT: Let me tell you, Mr. Lerner, I read your letter. I came in rather late this morning, after attending a funeral. But my recollection is that I have alerted the United States Attorney to this proceeding. I don't know whether Ms. Moore did or didn't, although I have a recollection of saying cc to Mr. Kaminsky who is an Assistant United States Attorney because I was concerned with the integrity of documents which were sealed and having read some

of the things which were annexed to the complaint which clearly reflected that portions of presentence report was divulged, that a cooperation agreement, portions of which may have been divulged. Those two documents, among others, which were sealed, were documents which if divulged, that is the contents, may seriously jeopardize not only the life of the person who was the subject of those documents. In this case it might also significantly affect matters of national interest.

Now, I received a letter from you on Friday. It was rather late in the afternoon. I think it was approaching four o'clock. I didn't want to respond to you ex parte and I wasn't about to sit down and start writing letters. I tried to communicate or had my law clerk try and reach Ms. Moore so we could have a conference and that didn't happen.

Again, just as I was a little nonplused with the first letter that I received from you, which I made some comment about on Friday. I don't think there's anything in my order, that is, the Temporary Restraining Order, the order to show cause, which would or could preclude a party to whom an order to show cause was addressed from conferring with his lawyer. Nothing in my order which would even hint at precluding Mr. Oberlander, or anybody else to whom that order to show cause was addressed, from conferring with his lawyer. The Sixth Amendment, whether it's applicable or isn't